

REMARKS

Claim Rejections

Claims 1, 3-6, 10, 12 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Isohata et al (US 6,288,489) in view of Kim et al. (US PUB 2003/0025428). Claims 2, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Isohata et al (US 6,288,489) in view of Kim et al (US PUB 2003/0025428) in further view of Reisenauer et al. (US 6,161,910).

Arguments

Careful consideration has been given to applicant's specification and claims, to the applied prior art references, and to the respective positions articulated by the Examiner. As a consequence of this review, Applicant offers the following arguments.

In Isohata et al. (US 6,288,489), according to the description in lines 24-34 of column 8, and Fig 5A, 5B, and 5C, the spacers 3 are disposed in places corresponding to the convex parts 181 of the plate 18b, that is, between the adhesives 1c. Apparently, the spacers 3 are definitely solid rather than chambers. The spacers 3 are the substitutions for the convex parts 181 of the plate 18b. With the spacers 3, the drawing or the press working process for forming convex parts 181 is no longer necessary. Since the spacer 3 is not a chamber, it cannot be an annular channel, as in the present invention. Although Isohata states that the spacer 3 can be applicable in the lattice form, it is still not an annular channel therein, much less capable of dividing the laminar attachment structure into an outer closed portion and an inner portion. Accordingly, the structure of the annular channel as disclosed in the present invention is clearly different from that of the spacer 3 as disclosed in Isohata et al.

In addition, according to the description in paragraph [0055] and Fig. 8 of Kim et al. (US PUB 2003/0025428), without the presence of the holes 54d, an original pressuring power must be applied to combine the heat conductive medium 54 with the chassis and the PDP. With the presence of the holes 54d, however, the overall area of the heat conductive medium 54 is reduced, and it is necessary to apply a

corrected pressurizing power respectively smaller than the original pressuring power to engage the combination. It follows that the function of the vacuum-pumping aperture as disclosed in the present invention is far different from that of the holes 54 as disclosed in Kim et al. Moreover, the Examiner has not provided any evidence showing that the holes 54d in Kim et al. are capable of coupling vacuum-pumping. In other words, the objective of the holes 54d in Kim et al. is not applicable to the vacuum-pumping aperture in the present invention. Furthermore, there is no motivation presented that Kim et al. intends to carry out vacuum-pumping via the holes 54d.

In summary, Applicant respectfully submits that the spacer 3 of the Isohata et al. is solid, and not an empty space. Accordingly, Applicant believes that the skilled artisan would not consider an empty space to teach or suggest the channel in the present invention. Furthermore, the function of the holes 54d in Kim et al. do not teach or suggest the vacuum-pumping aperture of the present invention. Applicant further submits that Reisenauer et al. fail to provide either of these deficiencies. It follows that the Examiner has not yet presented a *prima facie* case of obviousness with regard to Applicant's claims. As a result, Applicant has traversed the Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Applicant further maintains that there is not the slightest suggestion in either Isohata et al., Kim et al., or Reisenauer et al. that their respective teachings may be combined as suggested by the Examiner.

Applicant also maintains that neither Isohata et al., Kim et al. nor Reisenauer et al disclose, or suggest a modification of their specifically disclosed structures that would lead one having ordinary skill in the art to arrive at Applicant's claimed structure. Applicant hereby respectfully submits that no combination of the cited prior art renders obvious Applicant's pending claims.

Summary

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant submits that this application is now in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. Should any points remain in issue, which the Examiner feels could best be resolved by either a personal or a telephone interview, it is urged that Applicant's local attorney be contacted at the exchange listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 14, 2007

By:


Demian K. Jackson
Reg. No. 57,551

TROXELL LAW OFFICE PLLC
5205 Leesburg Pike, Suite 1404
Falls Church, Virginia 22041
Telephone: 703 575-2711
Telefax: 703 575-2707

CUSTOMER NUMBER: 40144